

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office

er er er det Gregorie de Symbol (†100 general) Gwww.yspto.gre

PPLICATION NO	HEING DATE	FIRST NAMED IN VENTOR	ATTORNES DOUBLE NO	CONFIRMATIONA	
(69.736,043	.2 12 2000	Yue Kuo	017575 04) 4 (TAMUS 7225 1529)		
Baker Botts L.L.P. 2001 Ross Avenue			EVAMINER		
Dallas, TX 75.			COLEMAN, WILLIAM D		
			ARTUNII	PAPER NUMBER	
			2828		
			DATE MAILED of 63 2003		

Please find below and or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application N	o.	Applicant(s)
		09 736,043		KUO. YUE
Office Action Summary		Examiner	· ·	Art Unit
		W David Cole	man	2823
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication	n appears on the cov	er sheet with the co	rrespondence address
THE ! - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu - Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RIMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION is consistent of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by seely received by the Office later than three months after the rid patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	ON. FR 1 136(a) In no event, ho on. In a reply within the statutory r period will apply and will expiritely statute, cause the application	wever may a reply be time ninimum of thirty (30) days re SIX (6) MONTHS from th i to become ABANDONED	ly filed will be considered timely ne mailing date of this communication (35 U S C § 133)
1)🗵	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	09 January 2003 .		
2a)⊡	This action is FINAL . 2b)	This action is non	-final.	
3) <u> </u>	Since this application is in condition for a closed in accordance with the practice ur on of Claims			
4)[<u>×</u>	Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-32 is/are pending in the	ne application.		
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	hdrawn from conside	eration.	
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)[_	Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-32 is/are rejected.			
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	and/or election requi	rement.	
pplicati	on Papers			
•	The specification is objected to by the Exam			
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are a)			
	Applicant may not request that any objection			
11)[The proposed drawing correction filed on _			red by the Examiner.
	If approved, corrected drawings are required		action.	
, —	The oath or declaration is objected to by th	ie Examiner.		
-	ander 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			(1)
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo	reign priority under	35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(a) or (t).
a)l	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:			
	1. Certified copies of the priority docur			- NI-
	2. Certified copies of the priority docur			
* 5	3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the Internation See the attached detailed Office action for a	al Bureau (PCT Rule	e 17.2(a)).	
14) 🗌 A	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dor	mestic priority under	35 U.S.C. § 119(e)) (to a provisional application).
) \square The translation of the foreign languag Acknowledgment is made of a claim for do			
ttachmen	t(s)			
2) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper N		<u> </u>	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) atent Application (PTO-152)
Patent and f	rademark 0"ce ev (04-01)	ice Action Summary		Part of Paper No. 14

Application Control Number: 09 736,043 Art Unit: 2823

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-4, 7-11, 13-20 and 22-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gardner et al., U.S. Patent 5,350,484 in view of Allen et al., U.S. Patent 5,736,002.
- 3. Pertaining to claims 1, 11 and 18, <u>Gardner</u> discloses a semiconductor process substantially as claimed. See **FIGS. 2A-2C**, where <u>Gardner</u> teaches a method for forming a conductive pattern for a semiconductor device comprising:

patterning a mask layer 4 outwardly from a conductive layer 3 of the semiconductor device, the patterning defining portions 6 of the conductive layer 3 where vias through the conductive layer 3 are desired;

exposing the semiconductor device to a plasma 10 using a plasma deposition reactor (please note that an ion implanter is a plasma deposition reactor), the plasma converting the unmasked portions of the conductive layer 3 into a compound 8; and

exposing the semiconductor device to a treatment process, the treatment process selectively removing the compound (column 8, lines 22-27). However, <u>Gardner</u> fails to teach wherein exposing the semiconductor device to a treatment comprises:

exposing the semiconductor device to a substantially inert atmosphere; and

Art Unit: 2823

heating the semiconductor device to between 300 and 800 degrees Celsius while the semiconductor device is exposed to the substantially inert atmosphere to remove the compound.

<u>Allen</u> teaches wherein exposing the semiconductor device to a treatment comprises:

exposing the semiconductor device to a substantially inert atmosphere; and heating the semiconductor device to between 300 and 800 degrees Celsius while the semiconductor device is exposed to the substantially inert atmosphere to remove the compound. See columns 9 and 10 where Allen teaches wherein exposing the semiconductor device to a treatment comprises:

exposing the semiconductor device to a substantially inert atmosphere, and heating the semiconductor device to between 300 and 800 degrees Celsius while the semiconductor device is exposed to the substantially inert atmosphere to remove the compound (please note that Allen teaches vaporizing copper up to 2000 degrees Celsius and therefore meets the claim limitations). In view of Allen, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the process steps of Allen into the Gardner semiconductor process because in theory, copper chloride, copper fluoride and copper oxide can all be selectively removed from copper by vaporization (column 9, lines 54-58).

- 4. Pertaining to claims 2 and 28, <u>Gardner</u> teaches wherein the conductive layer **3** comprises a copper material (column 6, lines 55-56).
- 5. Pertaining to claim 3, <u>Gardner</u> teaches removing the mask layer 4 from the semiconductor device 1.
- 6. Pertaining to claims 4 and 20. <u>Gardner</u> teaches removing the mask layer 4 after removing the compound 8.

Application Control Number: 09 736,043 Page 4
Art Unit: 2823

7. Pertaining to claims 7 and 15, <u>Gardner</u> teaches providing a barrier layer **2** between the conductive material **3** and the substrate (not numbered).

- 8. Pertaining to claims 8 and 14. <u>Gardner</u> teaches wherein the conductive material 3 comprises a copper material, and wherein exposing the semiconductor device to a plasma 10 comprises exposing the semiconductor device to a chlorine-containing gas (column 7, line 26).
- 9. Pertaining to claims 9, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29 and 30, <u>Gardner</u> teaches wherein the compound comprise a copper chloride material 8, and wherein exposing the semiconductor device to a treatment process comprises exposing the semiconductor device to a hydrogen chloride solution to remove the copper chloride material (See table III).
- 10. Pertaining to claim 23, <u>Gardner</u> teaches wherein the plasma comprises a chlorine-containing gas. It would have been obvious that the chlorine ion in table III of <u>Gardner</u> would suggest a plasma containing chlorine gas.
- Pertaining to claim 24, Gardner teaches wherein the plasma comprises a bromine-containing gas. It would have been obvious that the chlorine ion in table III of <u>Gardner</u> would suggest a plasma containing bromine gas.
- 12. Pertaining to claim 25, Gardner teaches wherein the plasma comprises a fluorine-containing gas. It would have been obvious to that the fluorine ion in table III of <u>Gardner</u> would suggest a plasma containing fluorine.
- 13. Pertaining to claim 26. <u>Gardner</u> teaches wherein the plasma comprises an iodine-containing gas. It would have been obvious that the iodide ion in table III of <u>Gardner</u> would suggest a plasma containing iodine.

Art Unit: 2823

- 14. Pertaining to claims 10, 17 and 19, <u>Gardner</u> teaches wherein the mask layer comprises a photoresist material 5.
- 15. Pertaining to claim 13. <u>Gardner</u> teaches wherein forming a conductive layer 3 comprises forming a copper layer outwardly from the substrate.
- Pertaining to claims 16, 22 and 27, <u>Gardner</u> teaches wherein exposing the electronic device to a plasma comprises controlling the exposure of the electronic device to the plasma 10 to form a substantially perpendicular interface between the masked conductive material 3 and the compound 8.
- 17. Claims 5, 12 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gardner et al., U.S. Patent 5,350,484 in view of Allen et al., U.S. Patent 5,736,002 as applied to claims 1-4, 7-11, 13-20 and 22-30 above.
- Gardner teaches a semiconductor process substantially as claimed, however, Gardner fails to teach the selection of removing the masking layers before removing the compound. Applicant is reminded that selection of any order of performing process steps is prima facie obvious in the absence of new or unexpected results. In re Burhans, 154 F.2d 690, 69 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1946). However, in the absence of new or unexpected results, the mere reversal of the order of performing process steps has been held to be prima facie obvious. In re Burhans, 154 F.2d 690, 69 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1946).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

19. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States

- Claims 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Allen et al., U.S. Patent 5,736,002.
- 21. Pertaining to claim 31, see **FIGS. 2, 3** and **4A**, where <u>Allen</u> discloses a method for forming a conductive pattern for a device, comprising:

patterning a mask layer **240** outwardly from a conductive layer **420** of the device, the patterning defining portions of the conductive layer where vias through the conductive layer are desired;

exposing, by plasma (column 9, line 28) deposition reactor, the device to a plasma, the plasma converting the unmasked portions of the conductive layer into a compound (i.e., copper chloride); and

exposing the device to a treatment process, the treatment process selectively removing the compound (column 9, lines 27-58).

Pertaining to claim 32, <u>Allen</u> teaches a method for forming a conductive pattern for a device, comprising:

patterning a mask layer outwardly from a conductive layer of the device, the pattern defining portions of the conductive layer where vias through the conductive layer are desired: exposing the device to a low energy plasma (please note that the term "low energy" is a relative term), the plasma converting the unmasked portions of the conductive layer into a compound, and

exposing the device to a treatment process, the treatment process selectively removing the compound.

Application Control Number: 09 736.043 Page 7

Art Unit 2823

Conclusion

- Applicant's amendment filed January 9, 2003 necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
- A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.
- Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to W. David Coleman whose telephone number is 703-305-0004. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor. Olik Chaudhuri can be reached on 703-306-2794. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7721 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

W. David Coleman Primary Examiner Art Unit 2823

WDC May 27, 2003 Michigan de la